



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

him a present. So he took him two of the offertory cakes. He found the man there as usual, and was waited on by him as before. And when he was dressed and going out he gave the man the present he had brought, by way of thanking him, begging him to take it kindly in token of charity. But the man, sorrowing, said, why do you give me this, Father? It is holy bread, I cannot eat it. I was once the master of this place, and have been sent here for my sins. If you wish to do me any good, offer it to God for me, and you will know your prayers are heard, if, when you come to bathe next, you do not find me here. Then he vanished, and the Presbyter saw by his vanishing that he who he thought was a man, really was a ghost. And when he came back after a week's prayer and Masses the man was no longer to be seen.

Now, we shall not discuss here what credit is due to these stories; our object in bringing them forward here is to show exactly on what foundation Purgatory rests, and at what a late period the belief of it was introduced into the Church. We have said elsewhere, that some modern Romanists have forsaken the Tridentine standard for a triple rule of faith—Scripture, tradition, and revelation. Now, the proof for Purgatory from Scripture and tradition altogether breaks down; and we wish it to be clearly seen that *asserted revelations* formed the ground on which the doctrine was first received, and by means of which its belief was fastened on the Christian Church for a number of years.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have been obliged to postpone several articles and letters from want of room.

We would request our correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JUNE, 1854.

THE intolerance with which the Church of Rome is often charged by her opponents has not unfrequently been defended as necessary to uphold her unity and immutability, which unity her advocates say could not be maintained were she to tolerate differences within her pale, as other Churches, not endowed with the same Divine authority, are compelled to do.

We have little doubt that the principal attraction which has drawn some men of respectable attainments from the Church of England to that of Rome, has been the idea of the much-boasted unity and immutability of the latter, with the stricter discipline exercised in upholding them.

That the Church of Rome, however, is *tolerant* enough, and even *flexible* enough, towards all who will even nominally submit to the all-important doctrine of her supremacy, appears to be pretty well practically understood in the present day, as, indeed, in all ages.

Great as her power has been and still is, there is always a wary prudence used in its exercise.

Of this we might give many instances, but let a few suffice—some of which we shall take from the conduct of the Holy See towards large classes, the rest from the conduct of the hierarchy towards individuals.

Those who have read the CATHOLIC LAYMAN since its commencement, will remember the signal *toleration* shown by the See of Rome towards the protracted and angry combat between the Franciscan and Dominican orders, touching the much-disputed doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary—which, after 300 years' discussion, with all the acknowledged prepossessions of the Holy See in its favour, has never yet, we believe, been definitively determined by the Church of Rome.

A similar *toleration* has been evinced by the Holy See towards the order of the *Jesuits*, who have, from time to time, published books containing the most dangerous and indefensible doctrines, not one of which has ever been prohibited by the Church of Rome, though she professes to condemn and prohibit the use of all bad books, and publishes, from time to time, such prohibitions in her Index Prohibitorius.

How are we to account for such toleration; and how is it consistent with her intolerance and persecution towards every attempt at reformation? Simply because she does not feel powerful enough to measure her strength with large and influential bodies within her own pale; and, therefore, could not prudently venture on what she knew would have been a vain attempt to put down a schism between two angry and powerful parties, both of which were willing to acknowledge her nominal supremacy, as long as she did not venture to exercise it against themselves; and because, in like manner, the Jesuit order is willing to give cordial support to all her pretensions, so long as she does not interfere with the doctrines and principles on which their system is founded.

Let us glance now at her dealing with individuals. The last week has witnessed the solemn inaugural profession of faith of the Very Rev. Dr. John Henry Newman, as rector of the newly-founded Roman Catholic University of Ireland. On this occasion the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen, titular Archbishop of Dublin, pronounced a discourse, in which, in the same breath, he proclaimed the unchangeable character of the doctrines of his Church, and held forth Dr. Newman as a man distinguished for his profound learning, as well as for his virtues and piety; while it is notorious, from Dr. Newman's own works, that he ventures to differ most widely from the Church of Rome on, at least, one cardinal point of the gravest importance to her theory and pretensions—her much-boasted immutability. In his celebrated essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine, Dr. Newman maintains that God did not intend that the form of doctrine, received in the Church, should be at all times the same; that He left in his Church an authority of *developing* new truths from those known before; so that it is not needful that Romish Christianity and Apostolic Christianity should be one and the same thing—that, in point of fact, they are two different things; thus throwing overboard the whole theory of Apostolic tradition as constituting, together with the Scriptures, the rule of faith, and resting everything on the inherent power of the Church to declare authoritatively what she thinks right, independently of both Scripture and tradition.

All Romish controversialists, except Dr. Newman, have contended that the Church of Rome has been *immutably* the same in doctrine in all ages, and that whatever she holds at this day is identical with what she derived in the earliest times from our Lord and his Apostles, either through the written Word, or oral tradition from the Apostles themselves.

Now, how comes the Church of Rome, through one of her highest officials in Ireland, to adopt this new-light theologian (converted, after a fashion of his own, to the Church of Rome) as a profound divine, worthy of being placed at the head of an establishment for the education of the Catholic youth of Ireland? Is it possible that the Roman Catholic authorities in this country can approve of, and intend to adopt, Dr. Newman's *novel* views? In America, Roman Catholic writers have seen very plainly that Dr. Newman's views are quite inconsistent with those which represent Catholic truth as always the same, and as handed down unchanged, by tradition, from the earliest ages; but in this country, he is the selected instructor of the Catholic youths of Ireland notwithstanding, and publicly vaunted

as a man of the most profound wisdom and learning.

Is not this a proof how far toleration may be carried in the Church of Rome, where it suits her purpose, and when it is thought wise to conciliate an individual who is likely to be influential or useful in the maintenance of her system, on the terms merely that he is willing to "recognise the Church of Rome to be the mother and mistress of all Churches, and vow obedience, absolute and entire, to the Roman Pontiff, and confess as faith all that the Catholic Church teaches?"

Had the principles set forth in the essay on Development been published by a Protestant, the book would, doubtless, have been placed long since in the Index Prohibitorius; but, being written by one willing to acknowledge himself an obedient son of the Mother Church, he is vaunted as a profound divine, and inaugurated as the principal of a Catholic University.

Another instance will be in the minds of such of our readers as happened to peruse the observations of the *Rambler* on Dr. Cahill, copied by us in our February number.

Dr. Cahill had written on the doctrine of transubstantiation in a manner utterly heterodox and inconsistent with the teaching of the Council of Trent. The *Rambler* exposed his erroneous teaching in the strongest and clearest manner, and assured the world that a very large proportion of the Catholic clergy and laity regard much of what he says as pernicious and untrue! "Why, then, it will be said," continues the *Rambler*, "is Dr. Cahill *allowed* thus to compromise the whole community of which he is a member? Why do the bishops and clergy permit him to write and lecture as he does? Why do not those who disapprove come forward and protest against his being accepted as a model of a Catholic controversialist?"

The explanation of the *Rambler* is worthy of attention. It is as follows (p. 176):—

"We reply, that the common idea that Catholics are like a regiment of soldiers on the field of battle, every one of them acting in obedience to orders, is a pure figment of the Protestant imagination. Knowing that we have a discipline and code of law, that we do regard our bishops as the successors of the Apostles, and that we profess the utmost unity in matters of faith, the world jumps to the conclusion that every bishop is invested with power equivalent to the very highest which ultramontane theology ever attributed to the Pope himself. A Catholic bishop is not an autocrat with uncontrolled power over the actions of his spiritual subjects. He administers and enforces the laws of the Church, and beyond these, whatever power he has, is a species of moral influence, arising from the weight justly due to his sacred office and character. At the same time, the fact that it is a moral influence, and not a legal right (by the word *legal*, meaning a right secured by the laws of the Catholic Church), makes it necessary that it should be employed with great care and prudence, and not pushed too far, lest an unwilling subject recalcitrate hopelessly. Accordingly, as a matter of history, we find that Catholic prelates—imitating the wisdom of the Holy See—are often backward in interposing in cases where Protestants expect their instant interference with the strong arm of authority, and if the future be like the past, this rule will continue to be observed to the end of all things."

Now, what is this, but simply that the Church is so tolerant, or rather so prudent, that she is ready to overlook anything in an unruly and unmanageable subject, even when confessedly propagating things, "*pernicious and untrue*," if he be only, willing, *nominally*, to submit himself to the *unexercised* authority of the Church and the Holy See.

The toleration, however, of the Church of Rome extends much farther than omitting to put in the Index Prohibitorius, books of an evil or erroneous tendency; it permits both bodies of men and individuals to teach, and inculcate in practice, many things quite at variance with her authorized dogmas and formularies.

We may instance the vast difference which she tolerates and connives at, between the theoretical and practical modes of invoking the saints. The former is laid down distinctly by the Catechism of the Council of Trent, part iv., chapter vi., question 3.—*Aliter Deum, aliter sanctos imple-*

ramus—"For we do not implore God and the saints in the same manner. We pray to God that He would either give us good things or deliver us from evil things; but from the saints, because they are in favour with God, we ask that they would undertake to be our advocates, to obtain for us those things from God which we stand in need of. Hence, we use two forms of praying, different in kind; for to God we properly say—"Have mercy upon us; hear us;" but to the saints—"Pray for us."

That this distinction is not followed in practice is notorious. Take the following specimens from the devotional works of St. Bonaventure, a saint canonized in 1482:—

"O, thou blessed Virgin, our salvation is placed in thy hands. Remember our poverty, O thou pious one! Whom thou wilt, he shall be saved; and he from whom thou turnest away thy countenance, goeth into destruction."—*S. Bonav. Op., Tom. vi.; Cantica ad B. Virg. instar Hab. 3, p. 480 (correctly 492). Ed. Lugd., 1668.*

Again:—

"Therefore, O empress, and our most benign Lady, by the right of a mother command thy most beloved son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that he vouchsafe to raise our minds from the love of earthly things to heavenly desires, who liveth and reigneth—*JURE MATRIS IMPERA tuo dilectissimo filio.*"—*Opera, Tom. vi., p. 466. Lugd. 1668.*

We notice another sample of saint-worship, from a French life of St. Philomena, published at Avignon, in 1836, and received since the publication of her life, in our last number (for which we are indebted to the kindness of a friend):—

"Faithful and glorious martyr, have pity on me, exercise on both my soul and my body the ministry of salvation, of which God has judged you worthy more than me; you know the number and diversity of my wants; behold me at your feet, full of misery and hope. I solicit your charity, great saint! Grant me my prayers, bless me," &c., &c.

Is this nothing more than the "Ora pro nobis?"

It would be easy to multiply instances of the wide difference between the practice and the theory of the Roman Catholic Church with reference both to doctrinal and devotional teaching.

For the present we cannot proceed with the subject further, but propose returning to it again; and, in the meantime, beg to call attention to the article, in our present number, on the Variations of Romanism.

REPRINT OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN—

VOL. I.

We are happy to be able to announce to such of our friends as have hitherto been disappointed in completing their sets, that we have reprinted (at very considerable expense) the first volume of our periodical, in consequence of the numerous applications for it, which we were unable to meet. In a few days Vols. I. and II., or either of them, may be had, neatly bound and lettered, on application to the publishers, Messrs. Curry, 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin; or, Messrs. Wertheim and Macintosh, Paternoster Row, London.

Correspondence.

MR. ROURKE ON THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH AND THE RULE OF FAITH.

(Continued from page 63.)

We believe that true faith is indispensably necessary for salvation—"He that believeth not, shall be condemned" (Mark xvi. 16); and "Without faith it is impossible to please God."—Heb. xi. 6.

We believe that Jesus Christ, requiring faith as necessary for salvation, must have provided us with adequate means to obtain faith—that is, to believe, without doubting, all those things which he has taught and instituted as necessary for salvation. If Jesus Christ has not provided us with such means, he must be a hard master indeed, as he would require of us what we could not otherwise perform.

We believe that Jesus Christ has established his Church for the above purpose—namely, as the supreme tribunal to regulate our faith; or, in other words, to keep the precious deposit of revelation unaltered, to explain to us (without any possibility of error) the meaning of every part of Holy Writ necessary for salvation, and, likewise, to preserve and transmit to posterity undefiled all that part

of Christ's divine doctrine, which was only delivered by word of mouth, either by Christ or by his apostles, according to these words of St. Paul—"Therefore, brethren, stand firm, and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word or by our epistles."—2 Thess. ii. 14 (it is the fifteenth verse in your Bible). By this text we see that the unwritten Word of God, transmitted to us by tradition, is entitled to the very same respect as the written word.

We think it absurd to assert that Jesus Christ has taught or preached nothing essential but what is written in a few pages of the Gospel. We do not find in the Gospel the instructions which our Lord gave his apostles during the forty days that he appeared to them after his resurrection; and yet it is beyond all doubt, that during these forty days—the last spent with his apostles—he instructed them particularly in all the mysteries of his kingdom and of his Church.—See Acts i. 3. These last instructions which Christ gave his apostles before parting, and when they were about entering on the arduous duties of the ministry—these last instructions, I say, were not lost, although not recorded in the Gospel; they form a part of that precious deposit entrusted to the Church, and have, by an uninterrupted succession of pastors, been transmitted, undefiled, to our present days, and will be thus transmitted to the most remote generations, even to the consummation of time. We believe, then, that the Church of Christ is the supreme judge in matters of faith, both to determine the true sense of Scripture, and to settle our belief with regard to that part of Christ's doctrine delivered by word of mouth. Whenever the Church has pronounced, the controversy is settled, doubts vanish, and we are as certain as if our Lord himself had spoken.

Common sense tells us, sir, that the Gospel could not have been intended as the supreme judge to fix our belief in matters of faith. First, because it may be misunderstood. The many contradictory doctrines drawn from Scripture prove that it is often misunderstood, and even in matters which Christ declares as an indispensable condition of salvation. Witness the following—"Except a man be born again, of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter the kingdom of God."—John iii. 5. "Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you."—John vi. 54. "Without faith it is impossible to please God."—Heb. xi. 6.

You will readily acknowledge that these several texts, although directing us to certain things, as an indispensable condition of salvation, are interpreted in contradictory ways, and, of course, misunderstood. Some find in the Gospel the necessity of baptism for salvation; others find in it salvation without baptism; some find in it the necessity of receiving the flesh and blood of Christ; others find that Christ gave us nothing but bread and wine as memorials of his death; some find in the Gospel that faith alone will save; others discover in the Gospel the insufficiency of faith alone; some find in the Gospel absolute and unconditional predestination; others reject it, as impious and blasphemous.

Now, sir, are all these right? Or will it be said that it is immaterial which of these contradictory opinions we embrace? No, sir; common sense tells us, that Holy Writ was not given us to be misunderstood, that when misunderstood it leads us astray; whereas it was intended to guard us against the misfortune of being led astray. Common sense tells us, then, that Scripture, being a dead letter, a dumb book, which cannot explain itself, Christ must have provided some visible and living authority, some supreme and unerring tribunal to explain Scripture, and that this is, and can be no other than the Church.

A second reason why Scripture cannot be our supreme judge in matters of faith is, because there are many that cannot read.

A third reason—The gospels and epistles were not written for many years after the Church of Christ was established, and spread among many nations. For many hundred years after that, the art of printing, not having been discovered, the Holy Scripture could not be in many persons' hands; and yet, during that time, the precious deposit of faith was as well kept as it has been since Holy Writ is in the hands of everybody. Yes, sir, and better; everybody cannot read, but everybody, learned or unlearned, can submit to the Church, transmitting to both, by the assistance of the Holy Ghost, the doctrine of Christ, uncorrupted, and in its primitive purity. Here, sir, is a mode of instruction adapted to everybody's capacity.

A fourth reason—If I must take up my creed by reading Scripture, I must be satisfied that the book which is put into my hands, and called the Holy Scripture, is really the genuine Scripture, as written by the apostles. I, a poor, illiterate man, not having enjoyed the benefit of a liberal education, hardly acquainted with my own language, how shall I know whether the English Bible you put into my hands is a faithful translation of the original Hebrew and Greek or not? I shall have to take your word for it! If I do, my faith then, to use a homely phrase, is pinned to your sleeve. But no, sir, I cannot submit to do so, because I find material differences in different translations of the Scriptures; of course, I am kept in suspense, if I know of none but a barely human authority in support of each of the different translations.

These are sufficient reasons to induce us to believe that Holy Writ was not intended to be our supreme judge in

matters of faith, and to convince us that Christ, our Lord and Saviour, has provided us with a living, visible, and supreme authority, to settle all our doubts, with regard to the true translation of Scripture, the true sense of it, and, likewise, with regard to many other essential matters not to be found in Holy Writ, but delivered by tradition. It is plain then, that the Church which our Lord established on earth, is this living, visible, and supreme authority; and if it be asked where this authority resides, we answer, in the body of Christ's ministers, the pastors of his Church, and the lawful successors of those pastors whom he appointed; and invested with full authority to discharge the functions of his ministry. To that body of pastors we look for heavenly instructions; in them we see the successors of Jesus Christ, invested by him with the same authority which he had received from his heavenly Father—"As the Father hath sent me, I also send you."—John xx. 21. Can you, sir, or "Bedale," or the "Kildare Churchman," or Mr. O'Mara, prove me to be in error for putting full confidence in the assertions and promises of our Lord, and in thus believing that the Spirit of Truth never has departed, and never will depart, from the pastors of Christ's Church? No; you will never be able to do so, because all things shall pass away, but Christ's Word will remain: Jesus Christ yesterday, to-day, and the same for ever.

The true minister of Christ, speaking of the name of his divine master, must speak with authority, with certainty, without any hesitation, on all the different mysteries of religion on which he is obliged to instruct his flock.

The apostles of Christ, scattered over the globe, preached one and the same doctrine, because Christ was with them.—Matt. xxviii. 18-20. The ministers of Christ, in 1854, scattered over the globe, preach, likewise, one and the same doctrine, because Christ is still with them. "I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."—St. Matt.

The apostles of Christ received the confessions of the faithful—see Acts xix. 18. They had received from Jesus Christ the power of forgiving and retaining sins—see John xx. 22, 23. The ministers of Christ, in 1854, likewise hear the confessions of the faithful, because they have no idea that Christ ever deprived them of that power. The apostles of Christ submitted to the decisions of the whole Church, because they knew the Church to be guided by the Holy Ghost.—Acts xv. 23. The ministers of Christ, in 1854, likewise submit to the decision of the general councils of the Church, because they know that the Holy Ghost is as much with the Church now as he was immediately after her institution. In short, we do not conceive why less spiritual powers should be attributed to the ministry of Christ in 1854 than in the year 100 or 300, &c., for at all times, and in all ages, the ministry is, most assuredly, intended for the same functions.

Is it not a pity, sir, that things on which our salvation depends should be only matters of opinion? It is my opinion, says one, that children may be saved without baptism; it is my opinion, says another, that God is too merciful to damn souls for ever; I think, says a third, that it is immaterial what a person believes, or what religious creed he adopts, so he leads a good life. It is your opinion, and you think! Pray, are you certain? and if you are not certain in matters of such weight, how can you be happy? Oh! will you leave it to the day of judgment to disclose whether you were right or wrong? Or, will you not rather renounce that fallible guide—your limited and corrupted reason—which never can give you certainty in matters of revelation, and apply for spiritual knowledge to the fountain of eternal truth, the holy Catholic Church, guided by the Holy Ghost, that you may no longer feed on opinions and uncertainties, but repose in the bosom of certainty.

I now must conclude, as I fear I have already disregarded your request to be brief.

Hoping you will have the kindness to insert this "misty cloud of words" in the next number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, I bid you farewell for a month.

I remain, sir, in sincere charity, your Christian friend,

WILLIAM ROURKE.

The important question raised by Mr. Rourke in this part of his letter, and on which his remarks, for the most part, turn, is briefly this—Is, or is not, Holy Scripture the supreme and sufficient rule in matters of faith? If this question be decided in the affirmative, it is obvious that all Mr. Rourke's arguments fall, at once, to the ground. We have discussed this question before, on more than one occasion; and we are now obliged, in reply to our correspondent's letter, to enter upon it again at some length.

Mr. Rourke's argument involves this fundamental assumption, that God, in giving a revelation to mankind, must necessarily have taken measures to guard it from all possible misconception or perversion, at least in essential points. This assumption we must explicitly deny. It is refuted by the analogies of the patriarchal and Jewish revelations, and it is also contradicted by the general analogy of God's dealings with us in the most important matters connected with our temporal well-being. In the case of the patriarchs, we do not find that any provision was made for the necessary and infallible understanding of the few and essential truths then communicated to mankind. On the contrary, though God kept up the memory of Himself by repeated revelations—to Adam, to Enoch, to Noah—we find that so universally was religion corrupted